

**Response**

Applicants do not understand why the Examiner has imposed an election-of-species requirement *after* having examined all claims of the application and *after* having received Applicants' challenge to the *prima facie* basis for the initial rejections. Nevertheless, in response to the current requirement, Applicants elect *Species B* as identified in the Office Action. This election encompasses all of *claims 16-23*, with claim 23 being included at least because of the discussion of housing body 202 occurring at lines 25-26 of page 6 of the application.

Applicants incorporate herein the arguments in support of patentability made in the Amendment and Response dated May 26, 2010. Accordingly, Applicants request that elected claims 16-23 be allowed. Moreover, because claim 16 should be allowable, Applicants request that (unelected) dependent claim 24 be allowed as well.

**Conclusion**

Applicants request that the Examiner allow claims 16-24 and that a patent containing these claims issue in due course.

OF COUNSEL:

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
(404) 815-6528

Respectfully submitted,

  
Dean W. Russell  
Reg. No. 33,452  
Attorney for the Assignee